

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed and considered the Advisory Action mailed June 26, 2007. Claims 16-32 are currently pending. The Applicants thank the Examiner for clarifying the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. Responsive to the Examiner the Applicants herein amend claim 16 to add a comma in-between “future viewing” and “during presentation.” Notably, this comma was already present in independent claim 27.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, Applicants submit that all of the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner’s characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner’s statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 16-32 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1

Claims 16-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Responsive to the Examiner, the Applicants herein amend claim 16 and respectfully traverse the rejection.

In light of the amendment to claim 16 provided above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims now support the Applicants’ interpretation of the claims and preclude the broad interpretation asserted by the Examiner. Furthermore, as requested by the Examiner and previously presented, the support for the claims are provided below.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are supported by the alternative exemplary embodiment described with respect to FIGs. 5 and 6. Specifically, the Applicants’ specification teaches an option for storing the broadcast advertisement that is currently being broadcast. (See e.g., Applicants’ specification, p. 16, l. 16 – p. 17 , l. 5.) Note that the storage refers to the broadcast promotional

advertisement that was already selected. (See e.g., Applicants' specification, p. 15, ll. 4-11.)

Moreover, the Applicants submit that FIG. 6 also clearly depicts an option to record an interactive advertisement during presentation of the interactive presentation. For example, when viewing the interactive advertisement, the user may select a key to access EPG features. (See e.g., Applicants' specification, p. 18, ll. 1-8.) Subsequently, the metadata instructs the presentation software that two options are available for the currently viewed advertisement: recording the advertisement to memory or setting a reminder. (See *Id.*) Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the specification clearly supports the claims.

As such, Applicants submit that claims 16-32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall or Jimmy Kim at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

7/17/07



Eamon J. Wall
Attorney, Reg. No. 39,414
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702